

**New Mexico - Las Vegas Field Office**  
**FY 2004 Ranking Criteria Worksheet-Grazing Lands**

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Farm No. \_\_\_\_\_ Tract No. \_\_\_\_\_ CMS Field No's. \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Non-Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Preliminary Rating \_\_\_\_ Final Rating \_\_\_\_

**1. Plants - (Potential Points 100)**

Note: Instructions on separate sheet		% Area in Contract Before Treatment	% Area in Contract After Treatment.	Potential Points	Points - Bench Mark	Points - After
<b>Rangelands:</b>	SI of 76-1 00 w/trend up or not apparent	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	100		
Ecological	SI of 51-75 with upward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	80		
Site	SI of 51-75 with downward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	70		
Similarity	SI of 26-50 with upward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	60		
Index	SI of 26-50 with downward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	50		
(SI)*	SI of 0-25 with upward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	40		
	SI of 0-25 with downward trend	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	% ____ + ____ + ____ =	0		
<b>Riparian</b>	Use Attachment 1, 2, or 3	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	% Quality After: _____	100		
<b>Grazed Forest:</b>	Use Attachment 4	% Quality Bench Mark: _____	% Quality After: _____	100		
<b>1. Plants</b>		Total	100%	Total	100%	<b>Total:</b>

**2. Conservation practice(s) Selection - (Potential Points 110)**

Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the EQIP Contract must be a cost-shared practice or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans.			Potential Points	Percent of Need to be Treated	Points - After
Soil Erosion(sheet & rill); Water(Inefficient use); Plants(Produtivity, health & vigor); Animals(Domestic - Inadequate quantity & quality of feed & water)					
Pumping Plant (533)			10		
Fence (382)			10		
Well (642)			10		
Watering Facility (614)			5		
Pipeline (516)			10		
Spring Development (574)			10		
Pond (378)			10		
Prescribed Grazing (528A)			50		
Soil erosion (Ephemeral gully), Water quantity (Excessive runoff), Plant condition(Invasive plants), Animals(Inadequate quantity or quality of feed)					
Brush Mangement					
Level of infestation	% Area Needing Treatment	% Area to be Treated in Contract	Potential Points	Bench Mark	Points - After
Light			20	0	
Medium			40	0	
Heavy			60	0	
Note Multiply % Area Needing Treatment by % Area Treated In Contract by Points to get After for each Level of Infestation					
		Total:			
Soil erosion (Classic gully)					
Grade Stab. Structure (410) or Diversion (362)			10		
2. Conservation Practice Selection			Total:		

**New Mexico - Las Vegas Field Office**  
**FY 2004 Ranking Criteria Worksheet-Grazing Lands**

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Farm No. \_\_\_\_\_ Tract No. \_\_\_\_\_ CMS Field No's. \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Non-Tribal Land \_\_\_\_\_ Preliminary Rating \_\_\_\_ Final Rating \_\_\_\_

**3. Other Considerations - 35 Potential Points**

Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.	Potential Points	Bench-mark	Points - After
A. At risk species habitat will be enhanced (List the species impacted)	5	0	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	5	0	
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active/proposed sec. 319 project.	5	0	
D. The land is with in a NMED designated Category 1 watershed	5	0	
E. Proposed contracted area will be treated to eradicate and/or prevent infestation of Class A and/or Class B noxious weeds, as designated by NMDA.	15	0	
<b>3. Other Considerations</b>	<b>Total:</b>		
<b>Minimum points for enrollment is - 30</b>			
<b>Designated Conservationist</b> _____		<b>Date</b> _____	